

**REMARKS**

**Claim Rejections**

Claims 6-7 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hileman et al. (US 5,259,783). Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hileman et al.

**Claim Amendments**

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claim 11 and has amended claims 6 of this application. It is believed that the amended claims specifically set forth each element of Applicant's invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, and define subject matter that is patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art.

The cited reference to Hileman et al. teaches a base portion (61) having a pair of snaps (62) connected to a mother board (50), an upper arm (68) with a grip (63), and a lower arm (67) with a grip (64). The upper arm and the lower arm are pivotally connected to the base portion and pivot in a plane that is perpendicular to a plane of the motherboard.

Hileman et al. do not teach the pivot member rotates in a plane parallel to planes of the circuit board and the electric board, nor do Hileman et al. teach the base includes two mounting portions located in mounting holes of the circuit board and spaced apart from the joint portion.

It is axiomatic in U.S. patent law that, in order for a reference to anticipate a claimed structure, it must clearly disclose each and every feature of the claimed structure. Applicant submits that it is abundantly clear, as discussed above, that Hileman et al. do not disclose each and every feature of Applicant's amended claims and, therefore, could not possibly anticipate these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Absent a specific showing of these features, Hileman et al. cannot be said to anticipate any of Applicant's amended claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

It is further submitted that Hileman et al. do not disclose, or suggest any modification of the specifically disclosed structures that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at Applicant's claimed structure. Thus, it is not

believed that Hileman et al. render obvious any of Applicant's amended claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

**Summary**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner not be of the opinion that this case is in condition for allowance, it is requested that this amendment be entered for the purposes of appeal, since it materially reduces the issues on appeal by cancelling claim 11, thereby rendering moot the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 6, 2006

By:

  
John R. Guice, Jr.  
Reg. No. 39,699

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC  
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404  
Falls Church, Virginia 22041  
Telephone: 703 575-2711  
Telefax: 703 575-2707